DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 225 898 SO 014 469

AUTHOR Gold, David
TITLE Socialization to Occupational Roles. Discussion Paper 74-2.
INSTITUTION Portola Inst., Inc., Menlo Park, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Feb 74
GRANT NE-G-00-3-0205
NOTE 34p.; For related documents, see SO 014 468-473. Not available in paper copy due to marginal legibility of original document.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Childhood Attitudes; *Cultural Influences; *Education Work Relationship; *Employment Level; Occupations; Research Needs; Social Change; *Social Class; *Socialization; *Socioeconomic Status

ABSTRACT

An individual's socialization to occupational roles is reviewed in terms of the concepts and of the link between childhood socialization, social class, and occupation. The educational system and peer group influences are briefly reviewed. Occupational socialization is a general progression in which specific job training occurs only near the end of the process. Although several studies suggest the importance of seemingly indirect influences of cultural values, economic values, and the economic system, the relative neglect of occupational socialization in research suggests that it is considered in narrow terms. However, researchers have found numerous links between socialization practices and social class and between social class and occupation. Parental values that are passed on to children are the values that parents need to function in the workplace. Kohn (1969) suggested that occupation reflects all three of the major dimensions of stratification: economic (privilege); honorific (status); and political (power). Other research indicates that occupational socialization occurs as a result of the emphasis on discipline, subordinancy, external reward systems, and a bureaucratic rationale in the educational system. Further research should focus on historical experiences and links between socialization practices and models of social change. (KC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED225898

SOCIALIZATION TO OCCUPATIONAL ROLES

by

David Gold

Discussion Paper 74-2
February, 1974

SO 014 469

Project: Educational Requirements for Industrial Democracy

Portola Institute
540 Santa Crua Avenue
Menlo Park, California 94025

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant from the National Institute of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the National Institute of Education, and no official endorsement by the National Institute of Education should be inferred.

FOREWORD

One of the important functions of schools is the preparation of the young for the world of work. Research on the nature of educational organizations and the production of educational services has stressed the correspondence between the activities and outputs of the schools with the requirements of work organizations. In recent years worker dissatisfaction has been rising, and it appears that there has been an associated increase in employee disruption of production. Some business firms have responded to these problems by attempting to reorganize work to increase the participation of workers in decisionmaking and to change the nature of jobs. This movement towards greater "industrial democracy" is gaining momentum both in the United States and in Europe, and as a result it appears to be generating a new set of requirements for worker characteristics.

The purpose of the project on Educational Requirements for Industrial Democracy is to examine the correspondence between socialization to occupational roles generally--via education, in particular--and the organization and content of work. An understanding of this correspondence is then applied to the study of changes in the nature of work in order to predict new demands that will be placed on the education system and other institutions of socialization. The analysis of possible responses of educational institutions to such demands will inform debate on educational reforms at both the curricular and institutional level.

The project research involves parallel examination of schools and firms in order to ascertain the correspondence between the formation and utilization of workers' traits in the context of traditional modes of work organization and under the various approaches to industrial democracy. This research will include the study of the supply of worker traits, socialization to occupational roles, educational production relations in the U.S. schools, the operation of U.S. labor markets and the demand for educational characteristics, and the relationship between worker characteristics, job characteristics and worker productivity.

A taxonomy of educational reforms and a taxonomy of the dimensions of work reform will be developed to provide an analytic framework for

describing important distinctions between reforms of education and work respectively. Commonly proposed reforms, and reforms with which there is some practical experience will be described with the aid of these taxonomies.

A survey will be conducted of selected firms in the U.S. and abroad that have experimented with different forms of work reorganization constituting varying degrees of industrial democracy. Similarly, a survey is planned of selected schools that are experimenting with corresponding types of school reorganization and educational reforms. Special attention will be given to the relevance of the most prominent types of educational reform for changing the educational characteristics of workers in order to meet the new work requirements.

The discussion paper presented here is part of a series of papers reporting on-going research. The final project report will represent a comprehensive document that outlines the probable extent and impact of work reorganization on schools and the educational system.

SUMMARY

This paper surveys some of the basic literature on socialization to occupational roles. The review is brief, emphasizing those areas of research that are most closely related to the project, with the goal being to establish a foundation for future work.

The survey begins with a review of the concept of socialization as it has been developed in different research traditions. Then, the concept of occupational socialization is reviewed. The point of view taken is that occupational socialization should be considered as a broad phenomenon, encompassing all processes that seek to mold and prepare people for entrance into the world of work. Specific job training, the learning of values and norms, and the learning of political and social roles are all part of occupational socialization. From this viewpoint, most of the existing research is narrowly based and does not adequately deal with problems associated with changes in the society and the economy.

The bulk of the paper reviews research on the links among childhood socialization, social class, and occupation. The work of Melvin Kohn and his associates is most prominent here. A shorter section discusses the educational system and possible links to other forms of occupational socialization. This will be continued later in the context of work on education being performed by other members of the project. Peer group influences on children are also reviewed briefly and this review will be continued into the next stages of the project. The review ends with a discussion of the occupational socialization of adults.

The last section of the paper discusses plans for further research. This work will carry the review forward by dealing with occupational socialization in the context of research on social and economic change. Other research, also a possibility for the future, is briefly discussed.

CONTENTS

FOREWORD ii

SUMMARY iv

Section

I. SOCIALIZATION 1

II. OCCUPATIONAL SOCIALIZATION 4

Social Class, Occupational Socialization, and the Family 8

Education and Links to Other Forms of Occupational Socialization 13

Peers and Play 15

Occupational Experience and Socialization 16

III. TOPICS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH 20

FOOTNOTES 23

BIBLIOGRAPHY 26

I. SOCIALIZATION.

Socialization is generally considered to be the process by which an individual becomes a functioning member of society, or "the process whereby the individual is converted into the person."[1] As a major research field, the study of socialization is relatively new, dating from the 1930's, although the problem of socialization certainly is not new. Such renowned scholars as Plato, in The Republic, and Rousseau, in Emile, articulated elaborate schemes for converting the individual into the person. Even Adam Smith, best known as the apostle of free enterprise, devoted some pages to what would today be called the dysfunctional effects of occupational socialization.[2] And perhaps the most widely known socialization scheme was that created by James Mill and applied to his son, John Stuart Mill.[3]

The basic issue in socialization research can be stated fairly simply: How does a society attempt to transmit across generations the basic characteristics that make the society operate? There are a number of phenomena that are thought to be important in intergenerational transmission. For some, the transfer of material wealth via legal inheritance is considered to be the most important. Others emphasize the cultivation of natural ability, or, in its most recent manifestation, the heritability of IQ. The study of socialization has as an implicit assumption the idea that social institutions are what is important about intergenerational transfer. Some observers deal only with social institutions while others are cognizant of the existence of relationships between the institutions that socialize and other phenomena in a society that contribute to the intergenerational transmission of the society itself.

Because it is a relatively new field, much of the research has only recently been brought together and synthesized.[4] This work is from a number of disciplines, with sociology, psychology, social psychology, political science, and anthropology contributing the most. The focus of socialization studies has varied and some of this variation can be explained by the differing disciplinary outlooks that researchers are encumbered with.

For some, the focus of a study of socialization is how the individual learns the norms of society. From this perspective, socialization is

> the whole process by which an individual born with behavioral potentialities of enormously wide range, is led to develop actual behavior which is confined within a much narrower range - the range of what is customary and acceptable for him according to the standards of his group.[5]

The discipline of psychology tends to emphasize learning by the individual, dealing primarily with personality variables. From this type of research one often gets a picture of socialization being a process whereby an individual selects from a range of characteristics. The "success" of the selection process is then an indication of how well socialized the individual becomes.

Others, sociologists mostly, place stress on the social apparatus which influences such selection. Socialization is represented by

> those patterns of action or aspects of action which inculcate in individuals the skills (including knowledge), motives and attitudes necessary for the performance of present or anticipated roles.[6]

The emphasis on situational variables that tends to characterize the research of sociologists and the tendency to look at individual variables that the psychologist brings to his or her work can lead to the same information being interpreted quite differently. Many researchers recognize this tendency toward partiality and try to develop broader frameworks where the various aspects of socialization can conceptually interact. Some research is explicitly developmental, where the results of socialization are treated as a prelude to further socialization. Whereas most of the early research on socialization dealt with childhood, more recent work has dealt with aspects of the adult world. Socialization becomes somewhat more specific, perhaps characterized as

> the process whereby a person acquires the attitudes, values, ways of thinking, need dispositions, and other personal, yet social, attributes which will characterize him in the next stage of his development.[7]

Some research has been aimed at linking socialization processes with other aspects of society. Since an individual is born into a social structure the history of how that structure evolved and the principles by which the structure operates will be crucial variables in explaining how the structure attempts to reproduce itself. Studies of stratification and mobility are beginning to include socialization processes in their explanatory models.[8]

II. OCCUPATIONAL SOCIALIZATION.

In modern societies the basic link to income and consumption is the job and the labor market. There are a number of exceptions: wealthy rentiers, impoverished welfare recipients, students on scholarships, young people being supported by their parents and wives by their husbands, and older people living on pensions all receive current income and consumption that is independent of specific labor market activity. But in all of these categories the individual is quite likely to experience substantial labor market participation during his life. In the case of students and pensioners the categories themselves represent stages of the life cycle surrounding the years of employment. With only a few, minor, exceptions individuals are expected to work and to be prepared for work.

Occupational socialization defines that part of the general field of socialization research which is explicitly concerned with how the individual is converted into the worker. The term occupation is a broad one with each occupation covering a variety of specific jobs. Socialization to occupational roles describes a fairly general process by which individuals are prepared for a range of possible jobs. It is only toward the end of the socialization process, when individuals are ready to enter or re-enter labor markets, or change from one job or occupation to another, that socialization emphasizes specific training. The amount of specific training, of course, can vary immensely, from almost nothing for an unskilled laborer to years and years for a psychoanalyst.

There are a number of reasons why occupational socialization is best viewed as a general process, with specific training being only one aspect. First, the performance of the duties associated with a job requires not just specific skills but general ones, as well as various personal characteristics. The vast majority of jobs today require reading, writing, counting, punctuality, and obedience. These skills and characteristics, since they are needed for all jobs, or for broad categories of jobs, can be part of a general socialization process.

Inkeles emphasizes the importance of the seemingly indirect influences of cultural values. He states that ". . . the child's acquaintance with the values implicit in various socialization practices may be more important than the manifest content he learns from these activities."[9] And he gives an example:

> Feeding schedules . . . should be understood not exclusively in terms of nurturance or in relation to the cycle of hunger pains in the infant, but also as expressing, and presumably communicating to the child, some of the emphasis his culture places on the ordering of events in strict accord with a clock-paced schedule. Such an orientation to time, if it exists, will, of course, be communicated to the child not through one infant-care discipline alone, but through several. The orientation to time will thus be expressed not only in feeding schedules, but in toilet training, play and sleeping arrangements, procedures for dress, and in numerous other ways.[10]

Inkeles recognizes that ". . . the values being thus expressed and inculcated in the child will not exist in a social vacuum . . . but . . . must inevitably reflect the influence of conditions in the social structure in which the values are operative."[11] With regard to the example of time, E. P. Thompson has argued that the relation between time and work was vastly changed by industrial capitalism. Instead of being governed by the seasons, and daily weather conditions, production became increasingly dependent upon the clock. The power of the clock over the worker joins with the power of the machine over the worker, as both are important elements of the technical side of the emerging social structure. For the worker:

> Internal time consciousness became a function of the industrial system, and punctuality in appearing for work was a requirement that, in highly integrated and rationalized manufacturing processes, became even more fundamental than the possession of manual skills.[12]

Thus, an element that we take so much for granted may have its origins, and possibly its current functional usage, in both social structure and particular job requirements.

Second, while some people receive a certain degree of pleasure from their work, are able to experience a genuine creativity in work, or feel some "commitment to a calling",[13] many, if not most, hold unnattractive jobs because that is the only path to income. Occupational socialization in this society requires a degree of conditioning that is relatively independent of the specific job or jobs the individual will hold in a lifetime. Part of such conditioning is getting the individual to accept not just the necessity of work but the conditions of work. If successful, such socialization produces a stability for the social order that is described in one way as follows:

> Internalization of norms has the great social advantage of reducing the necessity of surveillance and discipline. This has a special utility in the world of work, as reluctant and disoriented workers will perform as nearly as possible at the tolerable minmum of the role range, while the costs of supervising them will be high . . . occupations of professional status are granted varying degrees of autonomy in their performance. Unless balanced by self-imposed responsibility, the exercise of professional power would be intolerable and unstable.[14]

Here, the general phenomenon of the internatization of the norms of a society has different specific applications to occupational categories that are reasonably broad, but differ along a key dimension, the degree of control of the work activity. Thus, general socialization (learning of norms) can be broken into occupational categories as the norms learned are different, while each remains at a sufficient level of generality that it can be transmitted prior to the learning of specific job skills.

A third reason why much occupational socialization is general has to do with the nature of a specific economy and society. In capitalist economies labor is allocated via the market which allows an individual, in principle, to enter an occupation totally different from those traditionally practiced by his or her class, race, religion, or sex. Labor mobility improves the allocation of productive factors,

particularly when technology and needs are changing rapidly. For reasons of efficiency, the development of job related skills may be delayed until an individual is ready to enter a particular occupation, thus increasing the mobility of the labor force as a whole.

The actual movement of workers is only one aspect of the relation between mobility and socialization. Capitalist societies are also characterized by hierarchy in production and in social and political life. Such societies attempt to maintain their legitimacy by a variety of means and one of them is with an ideology that preaches equality of opportunity. One component of this ideology is the view that the individual worker is mobile, not locked into a slot because of birth. There is some intergenerational mobility in the United States though much of it can be attributed to economic growth and technological change, both of which have allowed children to attain more education and higher real income than their parents. The ideology, then, has some basis in reality. But the observed mobility is clearly less than the ideology preaches and there is much evidence for the existence of systematic mechanisms that perpetuate social and economic inequalities.[15] A set of socialization mechanisms which tries to preserve such inequalities while at the same time seeming to conform to the ideology would be highly functional for those at the top of the existing social structure. Thus, a system of occupational socialization that leaves specific training to the end, while employing a variety of general stratification mechanisms for the early stages of life would appear to conform to the needs both of ideology and economic efficiency.

The link between economic and ideological aspects noted above is also an example of the fourth reason for the generality of occupational socialization. Occupational roles frequently overlap with other roles that individuals are called upon to perform so that a general socialization process can lead to a number of functional applications. Thus, the sex-role socialization of women may prepare them both for roles in the home and in the labor market since most of the jobs open to women are closely related to activities performed in

the home - nurse, teacher, secretary, house cleaner.[16] The acceptance of authority that characterizes many occupational roles also pervades our political and social life so that, again, a general socialization practice may serve numerous ends.

Occupational socialization has not received the attention one would think it deserved, given the crucial role of an occupation in the life of an individual, and the importance of labor to society as a whole. Perhaps the reason is that "until fairly recently almost all studies of socialization concerned infancy and childhood, whereas occupation, almost by definition, is an adult position in the contemporary world."[17] In one of the main surveys of socialization literature the discussion of occupational socialization appears in the chapter on "Adult Socialization."[18] In other words, the relative neglect of occupational socialization appears to reflect the rather restricted concept of occupation that seems to be favored in the literature. When occupational socialization is conceived of in terms of the psychological and social characteristics that individuals bring to the labor market, rather than the problems encountered, say, in moving from school to job, job to job, or home to job, then it is clear that childhood and adolescence are important stages of an occupational socialization process. If socialization is, in part, a process where "behavioral potentialities of enormously wide range" are "confined within a much narrower range"[17] and if the purpose of such confinement is, in part, to prepare individuals for labor markets, then occupational socialization must be conceived of as beginning when the individual becomes the individual, literally at birth.

SOCIAL CLASS, OCCUPATIONAL SOCIALIZATION, AND THE FAMILY.

Researchers have found numerous links between socialization practices and social class and between social class and occupation.[20] In the context of the family, class appears to be a major determinant of socialization practices and outcomes. Danziger comments that: "Social class differences in the abilities, motives and values of children are too well known to require elaborate documentation . . . ."[21]

Occupation has been found to be "the most valid single measure of . . . position . . . in the stratification system of our society."[22]

The empirical link between socialization and social class in the context of the family is a convenient starting point. In a famous article on child rearing practices, Bronfenbrenner discovered that while actual practices changed considerably over time there was a clear continuity in the way that different social classes approached child rearing. Bronfenbrenner found that "parent-child relationships in the middle class are consistently reported as more acceptant and equalitarian, while those in the working class are oriented toward maintaining order and obedience."[23] While changes were observed at all levels of the social structure, he also found that "socialization practices are most likely to be altered in those segments of society which have most ready access to the agencies or agents of change . . ."[24]

The social class bias in socialization practices was given more substance with the publication of the results of a decade long study by Kohn and his associates.[25] In two samples of families in the United States and one from Turin, Italy, Kohn also discovered a clear link between social class and socialization practices in child rearing. In Kohn's work, the link is quite specific.

> First, there was the discovery that social class has a decided connection with parental values - that middle-class parents are more likely to emphasize children's self-direction, working-class parents their conformity to external standards. Then came the search to find whether or not this difference in parental values could provide a key for understanding class differences in parents disciplinary practices. The finding was that middle-class parents tend to respond to misbehavior in terms of their interpretation of the children's intent in acting as they do; working-class parents, in terms of the direct and immediate consequences of the misbehavior. Moreover, the difference in parental values has ramifications far beyond disciplinary practices - it affects major dimensions of parent-child relationships.[26]

Thus, Kohn was able to supply more than just a statistical association between class and socialization practice; in his research the link has substantive content. The attempt by parents to transmit a set of values that differs along the dimension denoted by class position is the explanation of why there are observed class differences in child rearing. The next question was: "Why does social class affect parental values?"[27] Kohn answered as follows:

> . . . I became more and more impressed with the remarkable parallel between the occupational conditions characteristic of each social class and the values espoused for their children by parents of that social class. Middle-class occupations characteristically deal more with the manipulation of interpersonal relations, ideas, and symbols, while working-class occupations are more subject to standardization and direct supervision. In short, middle-class occupations demand a greater degree of self-direction; working-class occupations require that the individual conform to rules and procedures established by authority.[28]

The parental values that are passed on to children are the same ones that the parents need in order to function in their occupations. This provides a very clear link between occupational requirements and socialization practices, even though the socialization at this stage of a child's development is still quite general. In making this explicit connection, Kohn is extending the statistical link between occupation and class that sociologist have long observed. Kerckhoff states that "More effectively than any other single measure, occupation reflects all three of the major dimensions of stratification," which are economic (privilege), honorific (status), and political (power).[29] In the sociologists lexicon, occupation is a handy, statistically valid shorthand measure of what is an infinitely more complex process, that of the segmentation of society into strata. Kohn initially held this view, but came to believe that occupation was substantively the most important:

> It did not seem likely that these occupational differences could completely explain the class differences in parental values. On the contrary, social class probably exerts so powerful an effect on human behavior because it represents the combined effects of occupation, education, and other potent variables. But the parallel between occupational circumstances and parental values seemed in this case to be centrally at issue. In this instance, the other variables constitutive of social class appeared to be secondary and reinforcing. Increasingly, the really critical variable seemed to be the degree of self-direction characteristic of occupations in the two social classes.30

Though there are other dimensions of stratification, such as race, religion, national background, income, and subjective class identification, and there are other dimensions of occupations, such as time-pressure and job dissatisfaction, Kohn's results indicate they are far less important than the degree of self direction on the job.

Kohn's results are impressive and provocative, but incomplete. He attempts to draw conclusions regarding economic inequality and forms of political behavior, but such conclusions are probably beyond the scope of his data. The information used was drawn from sample surveys and refers to the social position of parents and present socialization practices. There is no information on the eventual occupational position of the children. Thus, the conclusions of Kohn's study need to be supplemented and there are a number of possible ways this can be done. One would be to compare the socialization practices of families with those of other institutions, such as schools, and see if the same framework can be applied. Another would be to search for data on the occupational experience of individuals from different class backgrounds and see if the relative importance of early socialization can be measured. And a third would be to explore different models of society and social change to see what additional conceptual links can be ascertained. This type of work should keep in mind that early socialization is not final; job requirements can change and later socialization can affect the individual.

There is other research on the family that is pertinent to the relation between occupational requirements and socialization practices. Anthropologists have studied child-rearing practices in different cultural settings. Langman surveys this work and reports on his own study of three cultures, trappers in Northern Ontario, cultivators in the Yucatan, and industrial workers in Chicago.[31] His study was concerned with the relation between the requirements for the occupation that dominates the culture, and the socialization practices adopted for the children, with particular emphasis on the characteristics of independence and aggression. The results are not surprising. The trappers fostered greater independence in their children than the cultivators, as the occupational roles of the former produced a more nomadic life style and the production arrangements themselves required less cooperation. American industrial workers tolerated a higher degree of childhood aggression which Langman treats as the beginning of occupational socialization. Aggressive behaviour is thought to inculcate characteristics that are considered necessary for success in a society that is mobile and competitive.

It is not clear how useful studies like Langman's are for our purposes. Occupational and other societal characteristics are not always distinguished. For example, American workers live in a society where others, highly visible, engage in quite different occupations. The emphasis that Langman reports may well be due to characteristics independent of a parent's occupation. Thus the emphasis on mobility may be an indication of the success of a legitimating ideology. What would be interesting to investigate is the occupational experience of the next generation: Do these children who best assimilate these characteristics gain successful jobs? There are also weaknesses in comparative research of this type. While useful for highlighting certain aspects of the relation between occupation and socialization, cross-cultural studies are static. They have not been concerned with how socialization responds to changes in occupational requirements. Because trappers respond to their occupational conditions with certain forms of socialization does not mean that a more nomadic occupational

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

existence in the United States would lead in the same direction. Two societies at a point in time are not the same thing as a single society changing over time.

EDUCATION AND LINKS TO OTHER FORMS OF OCCUPATIONAL SOCIALIZATION.

Formal education is clearly part of occupational socialization. In recent years, economists have devoted substantial research time to the study of education as part of the process by which individuals invest in human capital. Behind this work is the idea that formal education is the primary means by which individuals obtain the skills and characteristics necessary for entry into the various strata of the labor market, the non-competing groups of Marshallian theory. Economists have also attempted to study how schools transmit skills and characteristics by manipulating various resource combinations. Work on human capital and educational production arrangements is being surveyed by others on the project. Rather than review the work on educational socialization in detail, this section will seek to indicate what types of links to other aspects of occupational socialization can be expected to occur in schools. A more detailed review of educational socialization work will be attempted later, when it can be linked more closely to the work on human capital and educational production relations.

First, there is substantial evidence that schools are concerned with much more than developing the cognitive skills of students. While this is hardly surprising, given the obvious importance of schools to socialization in general, there are also research results indicating that the non-cognitive aspects of schooling may be more important than the cognitive, and that both are class biased. Gintis has brought together a variety of evidence to argue that schools are most effective in socializing around the elements of discipline, subordinacy, external reward systems, and a rationality characteristic of bureaucratic structures.[32] Evidence on tracking systems and resource allocation within public schools lends support to the argument that there exists a strong class bias within public education.

Second, much research has pointed toward a conclusion that schools have done little to change the values, motivations, and aspirations that children attain through pre-school socialization. Thus, there would appear to be a prime facie strong link between family and school socialization. Evidence on the non-cognitive, class related socialization practices of schools would appear to fit nicely with available research on family socialization practices, discussed above.[33]

In a similar vein, a child's perception of the larger society appears to be well formed early in life. Simmons and Rosenberg found that by the third grade, children have attained a perception of the stratification system, including occupational rankings, that is essentially the same as that held by older children and adults.[34] They argue that this fits in with functionalist theories of stratification, since differential rewards are considered a necessary motivation for educational and occupational success. Perhaps, however, this is an example of children learning their roles early, and being fairly clear that their roles are eventually adult roles. Again, this indicates the strong possibility that the most important link between family and school socialization is that the latter reinforces the former.

A third possible link between occupational socialization that occurs in schools and that takes place in other institutions and activities is illustrated in the recent work on occupational mobility by William Sewell and his associates.[35] In their massive study of occupational structure, Blau and Duncan developed a model that sought to explain current occupational status with two sets of variables, father's education and occupation which were considered structural variables, and respondents education and first job, which were considered behavioral variables.[36] Sewell has attempted to extend this model by including a set of intervening social and psychological variables, including educational performance and educational and occupational aspirations.[37] The model takes each stage and explores how it affects the next one, so that predetermined variables such as father's occupation, can affect academic performance, which in turn can affect occupational aspirations. This allows the influence of

socialization to occur at different stages of development. The Sewell model is a clear advance over Blau and Duncan and other attempts at explaining occupational attainment by sociologists and is one of the few that makes a serious use of statistical methods.

PEERS AND PLAY.

Children are subject to a number of influences that are part of broader socialization processes and not all of these influences are institutional. Playmates are important and may be a crucial mechanism for teaching children about their culture. Play itself is an influence and takes on particular significance when it is remembered that children must be taught the distinctions between work and play as they are defined by the society. Relations with peers and the activity of play occur within various institutional contexts and may assume different forms in these various contexts. The research that is probably the most pertinent, what little of it there is, adopts the psychologists perspective by focussing on the individual, and less on the society and institution within which the activity occurs.

The dominant influence on the study of children at play has been the work of Piaget.[38] There has been almost no attempts to interpret this work in the context of occupational socialization; Millar's book, for example, contains essentially no discussion of social class differences in children's activities. Recently, Aronowitz has attempted to give Piaget's work an interpretation based on the sociology of Parsons and the reality of the American class structure. Piaget treats play as an important element in the stage by stage process of how a child attains the qualities we tend to label intelligence. Aronowitz argues that this framework fits into the Parsonian model of functionalism. ". . . Piaget's theory does not grant a creative role to the relationships of children to one another in play, friendships, and other forms of voluntary association. Instead, play is simply the reproduction of social roles and social structure assimilated from the adult world."[39] Aronowitz describes different types of games that children engage in and how they gradually develop into the mirror images of the dominance and hierarchy that characterizes adult life.[40]

Balbus has argued that sports is a major sex-role socialization device with the male role being the participant and aggressor and the female role the supporter and observor.[41] There is also an argument that differentiations between various sports, for example the team play of football versus the individuation of track, and within a given sport, say quarterback versus lineman, can serve to act as a means for differential socialization among males. In a discussion of the origins of extra-curricular activities in high schools, Spring has produced evidence that educators in the 1920's viewed football as a multi-faceted socialization device, helping to produce leaders (quarterbacks), followers or bureaucratic workers (linemen), consumers (fans), and a passive citizenry, who will come to identify their interests with those of "their" team.[42]

Attempts to reinterpret evidence on play, peers, and the role of sports at all levels of society is a fairly recent development, one that has yet to come to grips, at least in terms of empirical research, with occupational socialization or the reproduction of class relationships. But a major opening has been made and the possibilities are quite intriguing.

OCCUPATIONAL EXPERIENCE AND SOCIALIZATION.

After experiencing the socializing influences of family, schools, media, peers, and even various personal activities, the individual comes under the increasing influence of actual work. Conversations with family, friends, and school counsellors emphasize job possibilities and college, conversations with college officials and classmates emphasize jobs and graduate schools, and conversations with professors and classmates focus on professional activities and the job market. Over the decade starting at about age sixteen, individuals gradually become part of the labor force.

But occupational socialization is not over, and, in fact, continues even after people enter occupations. Many, if not most, individuals will change jobs and even occupations during the course of a working life. Some jobs and occupations are highly vulnerable

to changes in markets and technology while many people make frequent shifts in response to family and life cycle changes, or in search of the ever-greener pasture.

Both the entrance into a specific occupation or job and the change to a new one involves very specific training and, for the individual, the integration into a new organizational form. It may also involve a change in the individual's aspirations and motivations. At least at the level of professional activity, individuals tend to develop a stronger sense of identification with a particular occupation the longer they are associated with it.[43] Such identification may be weaker for people who are less successful, by the criteria of the profession, or who are more aware of the contradictions of the profession.

Until recently, there has been very little research on a general approach to occupational socialization among adults.[44] There has been research on problems in training or re-training workers. People with lesser skills, who might fall into a "submerged sector" of the labor force, experience wide-spread, even chronic, unemployment so that they represent a problem for socialization mechanisms of what Moore calls "continuous commitment."[45] More highly skilled workers and professionals will experience less forced mobility but they are likely to present serious socialization problems since their specialized skills are often not transferable. They may face prospects of declining status and income. A recent prominent example of this phenomena occured during the cutbacks in the aircraft industry around 1970. Unemployment was heavy among highly skilled scientists and engineers and many of them became salesmen, TV repairmen or drew welfare. In some cases, other firms refused to hire them because their skills were so highly specialized that they were not considered transferable even within similar industries. And in a few instances, firms would not deal with these people because it was feared that the scientists had assimilated too well the inefficient practices rampant in the aircraft industry.[46]

In a recent series of important articles, Kohn and his associates have extended their earlier work on the transmission of values and have looked at socialization within bureaucratic enterprises.[47] The basic issue being investigated is whether men's occupational experiences affect or reflect their psychological functioning. Does the job shape the man or does the already shaped man seek the job? While prior socialization plays an important role in an individual's choice of occupation, and may play an even bigger role in the employers choice of worker, Kohn has found that specific work experience continues to have an important influence as the individual grows older and works longer. As Kohn phrases it:

> There is a small but consistent tendency for men who work in bureaucratic organizations to be more intellectually flexible, more open to new experience, and more self-directed in their values than men in nonbureaucratic organizations. This may in part result from bureaucracies drawing on a more educated work force. In larger part it appears to be a consequence of occupational conditions attendant on bureaucratization - notably, far greater job protections, somewhat higher income, and substantially more complex work.[48]

Kohn has combined the results of this set of studies with his earlier work on child socialization to argue that the central fact of occupational experience today is not the ownership of the means of production, as Marxists argue, or status and income, as most sociologists would probably claim, but is the opportunity available for an individual to use initiative, thought, and independent judgment in one's work - self-direction.

As before, Kohn's work is among the most complete and provocative in this area. And as before, it's main weakness is that it is static, though here there has been some attempt to link job experience with earlier socialization.

An area of work that is crucial, but basically neglected, is historical studies of the socializing effects of job experiences. Moore hints at the importance of this type of research when he briefly describes some of the effects of industrialization.

> In the early stages of industrialization the factories and shops are commonly manned by voluntary but reluctant recruits, lacking even the general normative orientations . . . . These workers . . . constitute an important source of evidence on adult socialization. Labor commitment, which may remain less than enthusiastic during the entire adult years, nevertheless does occur. It is aided by the intersection of work norms with market norms, those of associations and interest groups, and - particularly in new nations - even with nationalist ideologies.[49]

III. TOPICS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH.

Occupational socialization is likely to remain one of the main areas of study throughout the project. The point of view taken here is that occupational socialization encompasses all processes that seek to mold and prepare people for entrance into labor markets, including specific ones, such as vocational training, general ones, such as the transmission of values, and overlapping ones, such as those aimed at sex-role differentiation. The study of occupational socialization, along with research on work requirements and worker characteristics, will be part of a continuing dialectic that informs the work of the entire project. For that reason, the study of occupational socialization is necessarily incomplete, at this stage.

This survey is also incomplete because the research being surveyed is itself incomplete. A theme that has dominated this survey is that existing research on occupational socialization is static. It has not dealt with historical experience, effects across generations of socialization practices, or links between socialization practices and models of social change. It is this latter area, the relation between occupational socialization and explanations of the dynamics of social change, that will be the focus of the next stage of the current work. To start with, three types of models of social change will be examined to see how they deal with socialization or to see where socialization has a logical and empirical role. These models are the mobility models that are being utilized by sociologists, human capital models that economists are developing, and Marxist class reproduction models.[50] This work will be leading toward the development of hypotheses regarding the effects of changes in work requirements on socialization practices, and the inter-relations among work requirements and other results of socialization.

One of the prime concerns of this work will be to analyze the concepts being used and the empirical measures employed. Occupation and social class, for example, are important concepts in research on occupational socialization. Both are quite complex yet tend to be

used in a rather simple fashion. Kohn's use of the idea of self-direction as the key component of an occupation is not devoid of problems. The degree of self direction of an occupation is not a single quality but is itself composed of numerous characteristics. It is not clear that there exists a useful way of making a simple ranking of occupations on the basis of self direction.[51] The use of the concept of social class also raises problems. It usually denotes various strata in a society and is static in its orientation. It seeks to measure what exists, not explain why changes occur. The concept of class that is based more on Marxian ideas is explicitly formulated to explain change and is perhaps of more use to the kind of work that this project is concerned with.[52] Other concepts, such as mobility, ideology, and productivity, will be analyzed along similar lines.

Another way of making the analysis more dynamic is to explicity analyze historical changes in work requirements and socialization mechanisms. A full review of historical literature on education and the nature of work would be most useful but it is probably beyond the scope of the project.

Establishing a direct link between the work on socialization and other project research will be another objective of the next stage of research. Some of these links are obvious. The concepts of productivity and occupation, for example, are also important to the study of work and worker characteristics. The economic aspects of education, mentioned in the text above, are important to an understanding of the role schools play in occupational socialization. An the media is an institution that is thought to have an increasingly important function in defining an individual's conception of reality. These ideas will be incorporated into future work.

Several areas of possible further research could significantly contribute to the understanding of socialization to occupational roles, but they are a little harder to pin down, at least at the present time. The importance of play, sports, and other peer group influences on children was discussed briefly above and this work will be developed where possible. The political aspects of occupational socialization, including its ideological component and the role of the state generally,

should be analyzed. Political socialization, in itself, is a field of study that can be explored with regard to links with occupational socialization. Federal, state and local governments are all important in determining how the educational system responds to changes in the society. Some of the available research on these topics will be incorporated in our study of socialization to occupational roles, but the topics merit more extensive examination than project resources permit.

FOOTNOTES

1. Danziger (1971), p. 13.
2. A. Smith (1937), pp. 734-5.
3. Mill (1964).
4. Two collections of articles surveying various aspects of socialization research are Clausen (1968) and Goslin (1969).
5. Clausen (1968a), p. 3.
6. Ibid., p. 4.
7. Inkeles (1968), p. 76.
8. See, for example, Sewell, Haller and Ohlendorf (1970).
9. Inkeles (1969), p. 624.
10. Ibid.
11. Ibid.
12. Aronowitz (1973), pp. 70-1. For Thompson's arguments see Thomoson (1967).
13. Moore (1969), p. 862.
14. Ibid., p. 869.
15. Bowles' research is particularly relevant to this argument. See, for example, Bowles (1972) and Bowles and Gintis (1972/73).
16. For more on this point see Goldberg (1974).
17. Moore (1969), p. 861.
18. Brim (1968) which appears in Clausen (1968a).
19. Clausen (1968a), p. 3.
20. These links are summarized in Inkeles (1969) and Kerckhoff (1972).
21. Danziger (1971), p. 125.
22. Kerckhoff (1972), p. 5.
23. Bronfenbrenner (1966), p. 377.

24. Ibid., p. 376.

25. Kohn (1969). Also, see Kohn and Schooler (1969).

26. Kohn (1969), p. ix.

27. Ibid., emphasis in original.

28. Ibid., p. ix-x.

29. Kerckhoff (1972), p. 5.

30. Kohn (1969), p. x.

31. Longman (1973).

32. Gintis (1971).

33. For one such argument see Bowles (1971).

34. Simmons and Rosenberg (1971).

35. See for example Sewell and Shah (1967) and Sewell, Haller and Ohlendorf (1970).

36. Blau and Duncan (1967).

37. Sewell, Haller and Ohlendorf (1970).

38. The work of Piaget and others is surveyed in Millar (1968).

39. Aronowitz (1973), p. 59.

40. Ibid., pp. 59-69.

41. Balbus (1973).

42. Spring (1972), pp. 121-22.

43. See the results of Becker and Carper (1956).

44. See the survey by Brim (1968).

45. Moore (1969), p. 875.

46. From conversations with Seymour Melman.

47. This work is still in progress. For some results see Kohn (1971) and Kohn and Schooler (1973).

48. Kohn (1971), p. 461.

49. Moore (1969), p. 874.

50. For an example of research on mobility see Sewell, Haller and Ohlendorf (1970). For work on class reproduction see Bowles and Gintis (1972/73). The literature on human capital is being surveyed for the project by Henry Levin.

51. See, for example, Blauner (1964).

52. Various conceptions of social class are discussed in Bottomore (1966).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aronowitz, Stanley, False Promises, McGraw-Hill (New York, 1973).

Balbus, Isaac D., "The American Game of Life," The Nation, May 7, 1973, 600-602.

Becker, Howard S., and James W. Carper, "The Development of Identification with an Occupation," American Journal of Sociology, LXI, 4 (January 1956), 289-298.

Bendix, Reinhard, and Seymour Martin Lipset, editors, Class, Status, and Power (New York: The Free Press, 2nd edition, 1966).

Blau, Peter M., and Otis Dudley Duncan, The American Occupational Structure (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1967).

Blauner, Robert, Alienation and Freedom (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1964).

Bottomore, T. B., Classes in Modern Society, (New York: Vintage Books, 1966).

Bowles, Samuel, "Unequal Education and the Reproduction of the Social Division of Labor," Review of Radical Political Economics, III, 4 (Fall/Winter 1971), 1-30.

Bowles, Samuel, "Schooling and Inequality from Generation to Generation," Journal of Political Economy, 80, 3 (May/June 1972), S219-S251.

Bowles, Samuel and Herbert Gintis, "I.Q. in the U.S. Class Structure," Social Policy, 3, 4, and 5 (November/December 1972 and January/February 1973), 65-96.

Breer, Paul E. and Edwin A. Locke, Task Experience as a Source of Attitudes (Homewood, Illinois: The Dorsey Press, 1965).

Brim, Orville G., Jr., "Adult Socialization," in Clausen (1968a), 182-226.

Brofenbrenner, Urie, "Socialization and Social Class Through Time and Space," in Bendix and Lipset, 362-377.

Clausen, John A., editor, Socialization and Society (Boston: Little Brown and Company, 1968a).

Clausen, John A., "A Historical and Comparative View of Socialization Theory and Research," in Clausen (1968a), 18-72 (1968b).

Danziger, Kurt, Socialization (Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1971).

Dreitzel, Hans Peter, editor, Childhood and Socialization (New York: Macmillan, 1973).

Gintis, Herbert, "Education and the Characteristics of Worker Productivity," American Economic Review, LXI, 2 (May 1971), 266-279.

Goldberg, Marilyn, "Sex Role Socialization," The Portola Institute, February 1974.

Goslin, David A., editor, Handbook of Socialization Theory and Research (Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1969).

Inkeles, Alex, "Society, Social Structure, and Child Socialization," in Clausen (1968a), 73-129.

Inkeles, Alex, "Social Structure and Socialization," in Goslin, 615-632.

Kerckhoff, Alan C., Socialization and Social Class (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1972).

Kohn, Melvin L., Class and Conformity (Homewood, Illinois: The Dorsey Press, 1969).

Kohn, Melvin L., "Bureaucratic Man: A Portrait and an Interpretation," American Sociological Review, 36, 3 (June 1971), 461-474.

Kohn, Melvin L. and Carmi Schooler, "Class, Occupation and Orientation," American Sociological Review, 34, 5, (October 1969), 659-678.

Kohn, Melvin L. and Carmi Schooler, "Occupational Experience and Psychological Functioning: An Assessment of Reciprocal Effects," American Sociological Review, 38, 1, (February 1973), 97-118.

Langman, Lauren, "Economic Practices and Socialization in Three Societies," paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association, New York, August 28, 1973.

McKinley, Donald Gilbert, Social Class and Family Life (New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1964).

Mill, John Stuart, Autobiography (New York, New American Library, 1964).

Millar, Susanna, The Psychology of Play (Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1968).

Moore, Wilbert E., "Occupational Socialization," in Goslin, 861-884.

Rafky, David M., "Phenomenology and Socialization: Some Comments on the Assumptions Underlying Socialization Theory," in Dreitzel, 44-64.

Sewell, William H. and Vimal P. Shas, "Socioeconomic Status, Intelligence, and the Attainment of Higher Education," Sociology of Education, 40, (Winter 1967), 1-23.

Sewell, William H. and Vimal P. Shah, "Parents' Education and Children's Educational Aspirations and Achievements," American Sociological Review, 33, 2 (April 1968), 191-209.

Sewell, William, Archibald O. Haller, and George Ohlendorf, "The Educational and Early Occupational Status Attainment Process: Replication and Revision," American Sociological Review, 35, 6 (December 1970), 1014-1027.

Simmons, Roberta G. and Morris Rosenberg, "Functions of Children's Perceptions of the Stratification System," American Sociological Review. 36, 2 (April 1971), 235-249.

Smith, Adam, The Wealth of Nations (New York: Modern Library, 1937).

Smith, M. Brewster, "Competence and Socialization," in Clausen (1968a), 270-320.

Spring, Joel H., Education and the Rise of the Corporate State (Boston: Beacon Press, 1972).

Thompson, E. P., "Time, Work Discipline and Industrial Capitalism," Past and Present, no. 38 (December 1967), 56-97.